



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,023	12/04/2001	Jon R. Stieber	180009.91206A	8248
26710	7590	11/02/2005	EXAMINER	
QUARLES & BRADY LLP 411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 2040 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497			YUN, EUGENE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2682	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/005,023	STIEBER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eugene Yun	2682	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no indication in the specification that the newly added limitation in which "the system control unit performs at least one of the operations of cash dispensing, providing for cash settlement and monitoring maintenance information without needing authorization of user access from a remotely located network host computer" is taught by the applicant. In fact, the applicant's newly added limitation teaches away from the specification. In paragraph [0029] of the applicant's specification, it states that "security features, including authentication and encryption algorithms, can be used to secure communications between devices" which contradicts the newly added limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2682

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Waller et al. (US 2001/0051922).

Referring to Claim 1, Waller teaches a networked cash management system, characterized by:

At least one cash handling device in the system for performing at least one of the operations of coin sorting, coin counting, note counting, note sorting and cash redemption (see paragraph [0057] where it is inherent that an ATM machine performs at least one of the above functions);

A system control unit 24 and 26 (fig. 1) and 24 (fig. 5) for performing at least one of a plurality of operations of accounting for cash dispensing by the cash handling device (see paragraph [0021]), providing for cash settlement of transactions carried out by the cash handling device, and monitoring maintenance information (see paragraph [0009]), said control unit also providing commands to the cash handling device for operation of the cash handling device (see paragraphs [0011] and [0014]);

wherein said cash handling device and said system control unit communicate through a wireless communication network operating according to a standard for locally distributed wireless networks (see paragraph [0011] noting “local wireless technology”); and

wherein the locally distributed wireless network communicates directly without intermediate servers and within a range between the cash handling device and the control unit of no more than approximately 100 meters (see paragraph [0011]).

Referring to Claim 13, Waller teaches a wireless networked cash management system comprising:

A system control unit including a radio frequency transceiver 24 and 26 (fig. 1) and 24 (fig. 5); and

A cash handling device, the cash handling device including a radio frequency transceiver for communicating cash handling data and status data to the control unit (see paragraphs [0011] and [0014]);

wherein the transceivers communicate directly with each other without the assistance of servers and wherein the transceivers communicate within a range of no more than approximately 100 meters (see paragraph [0011]); and

wherein the system control unit performs at least one of the operations of accounting for cash dispensing by the cash handling device (see paragraph [0021]), providing for cash settlement of transactions carried out by the cash handling device and monitoring maintenance information (see paragraphs [0011] and [0014]).

Referring to Claims 2, 16 and 19, Waller also teaches a coin handling device for performing at least one of the operations of coin sorting and totalizing, coin counting and cash redemption (see paragraph [0021]).

Referring to Claim 3, Waller teaches a currency handling device for performing at least one of the operations of note sorting, note counting and cash redemption, wherein

Art Unit: 2682

said currency handling device and said control unit communicate through the wireless communication network (see paragraph [0021]).

Referring to Claim 4, Waller also teaches the cash handling device as a currency handling device for performing at least one of the operations of note sorting and totalizing, note counting and cash redemption (see paragraph [0021]).

Referring to Claim 5, Waller also teaches at least one I/O device, wherein the I/O device is a cell phone or a personal digital assistant (see paragraph [0009]).

Referring to Claim 6, Waller also teaches the system control unit electrically connected to a second network selected from a group consisting of: the Internet, an intranet, a LAN and a WAN (see paragraph [0067]).

Referring to Claim 7, Waller also teaches the second network utilizing at least one of a telephone dial-up modem, a digital satellite link modem and a broadband cable modem (see paragraph [0073]).

Referring to Claim 8, Waller also teaches operation according to the Bluetooth specification (see paragraph [0011]).

Referring to Claim 9, Waller also teaches operation according to the RS-232 protocol (see paragraph [0070]).

Referring to Claim 10, Waller also teaches operation in a frequency hopping, spread spectrum range of frequencies in a range from 2.4 GHz to 2.56 GHz (see paragraph [0011]).

Referring to Claim 12, Waller also teaches operation in a piconet distinguished from other networks by a selected frequency hopping sequence (see paragraph [0009]).

Referring to Claim 14, Waller also teaches a Bluetooth radio (see paragraph [0009]).

Referring to Claims 11 and 15, Waller also teaches operation in the infrared frequency range according to the IrDA standard (see paragraph [0011]).

Referring to Claim 17, Waller also teaches the system control unit comprising a personal computer that performs at least one of the operations of accounting for cash dispensing, providing for cash settlement and monitoring maintenance information for a plurality of cash handling machines (see paragraph [0021]).

Referring to Claim 18, Waller also teaches a computer peripheral I/O device which is at least one of a printer or a visual display (see paragraph [0009]).

Referring to Claim 20, Waller also teaches the system control unit performing at least one of the operations of cash dispensing (see paragraph [0021]), providing for cash settlement and monitoring maintenance information without needing authorization of user access from a remotely located network host computer (see paragraphs [0011] and [0014] noting that the operation of monitoring maintenance information does not need the authorization of a remotely located device).

Referring to Claim 21, Waller also teaches the system control unit performing both of the operations of providing for cash settlement (see paragraph [0021]) and monitoring maintenance information (see paragraphs [0011] and [0014]).

Referring to Claim 22, Waller also teaches at least one I/O device, wherein the I/O device is a cell phone or a personal digital assistant (see paragraph [0009]).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful consideration of the applicant's argument and amendments, the examiner still believes that the Waller reference reads on the applicant's claims and that the handheld PDA device in the Waller reference can equate to the system control unit in the claimed invention. Referring to paragraph [0021] of the specification of the claimed invention, it states that "the system control unit preferably comprises a computer, such as a personal computer, workstation, or other computing device." Based on that statement, the examiner now believes that the term "system control unit" can be viewed much more broadly since it can be any computing device. The handheld PDA in the Waller reference is indeed a computing device and therefore, in addition to the fact that nothing else in the independent claims state otherwise, the handheld PDA in the Waller reference can clearly equate to the system control unit in the claimed invention. This also proves that even if the examiner must refer to the specification for the exact meaning of a system control unit, the handheld PDA in the Waller reference still can equate to the system control unit in the claimed invention.

The examiner slightly modified the rejection in the independent claims in order to read on the newly submitted amendments. The examiner still believes that the limitation of "monitoring maintenance information" is shown in paragraphs [0011] and [0014] of

the Waller reference. In paragraph [0014] it teaches that the cash handling device can transmit status information to the user's portable device, which is believed by the examiner to equate to monitoring maintenance information. However, even if the above were not true, the limitation of "accounting for cash dispensing by the cash handling device" is very clearly taught in paragraph [0021] of the Waller reference. Only one of the limitations needs to be taught.

In response to the argument that the Waller reference does not teach any embodiment with two PDAs, it is not stated anywhere in the claims, especially the independent claims, that two PDAs are needed. Therefore, the examiner considers this argument moot.

The examiner believes that the claiming of an I/O device in claims 5, 18, and 22 simply narrows the interpretation of what the system control unit can be. Either way, Waller still teaches a PDA, which is an I/O device.

Finally, the examiner reiterated the previous 112 rejection towards claim 20 stating that the specification did not support the limitation in which "the system control unit performs at least one of the operations of cash dispensing, providing for cash settlement and monitoring maintenance information without needing authorization of user access from a remotely located network host computer". The applicant argued that because the specification somewhat stated that authorization of user access is optional, it is inherent that authorization is not needed. The examiner reintroduces the statement in paragraph [0029] of the applicant's specification, stating that "security features, including authentication and encryption algorithms, can be used to secure

Art Unit: 2682

communications between devices". When the above cited passage is combined with the fact that nowhere in the specification specifically taught the fact that authorization of user access from a remotely located network host computer is **not needed** or **not required**, one skilled in the art can also believe that it is inherent that authorization is mandatory. Therefore, the examiner still believes that not enough support is supplied by the specification in order to discount the limitations in claim 20 as new matter.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2682


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Quochien Vuong can be reached on (571)272-7902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Eugene Yun
Examiner
Art Unit 2682

EY


MARCEAU MILORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER